

Past Performance Questionnaire / Survey – Attachment 2
Solicitation: W912CZ-06-Q-0005 Protestant REC

Note to Prospective Quoters: Please provide this form to *at least two* other companies or agencies you have performed work for. Their response via fax or email, NLT 10AM October 26, 2005 is requested. Fax 907-384-7118, attn: Jerry Soper; jerry.l.soper@us.army.mil

I CONTRACT / VENDOR IDENTIFICATION

1. Contractor Name / Company _____
2. Contract Number: _____
3. Contact Type: _____
- Competitive: ☐ Yes ☐ No
4. Period of Performance: _____
5. Current Contract Cost: _____
6. Description of Services: _____

II AGENCY / EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION

1. Name: _____
2. Location of Project: _____
3. Name of Person Providing Information: _____
4. Telephone Number: _____
5. Duty Title: _____
6. Date of Questionnaire Completion: _____
7. May we call you? _____

III EVALUATION

1 QUALITY OF SERVICE:

Did the Contractor meet/not meet/exceed Contract Requirements for Quality of Service?

MET ☐

NOT MET ☐

EXCEEDED ☐

(a) Please explain how the Contractor met/did not meet/exceeded the contract requirements regarding quality of service and provide any strengths and/or weaknesses (e.g. Quality Control Plan).

(b) Were there any problems encountered and/or Contract Discrepancy Reports (CDRs) issued? What were the CDRs issued for and when? Did the Contractor correct the problem?

The quality of service can be measured by how well the offeror conformed to or met Contract requirements, specifications and standards of good workmanship (e.g. commonly accepted technical, professional, environmental, or safety and health standards).

2(a) SCHEDULE: Did the Contractor meet/did not meet/exceed the schedule requirements (e.g. Milestones/Deliverables)? (Timeliness)

MET ☐

Past Performance Questionnaire / Survey – Attachment 2
Solicitation: W912CZ-06-Q-0005 Protestant REC

NOT MET [☐]
EXCEEDED [☐]

Please explain how the Contractor met/did not meet/exceeded the schedule requirements and provide any strengths and/or weaknesses.

Schedule can be measured in terms of the timeliness, in which the Contractor completes, or has completed, milestones, administrative requirements, contract requirements (e.g. efforts that contribute to or effect the schedule variance).

2(b) SCHEDULE: Did the Contractor meet/not meet/exceed the administrative requirements (e.g. invoices/billings, schedules)?

MET [☐]
NOT MET [☐]
EXCEEDED [☐]

Please explain how the Contractor met/did not meet/exceed the administrative requirements and provide any strengths and/or weaknesses.

3. BUSINESS RELATIONS: Did the contractor meet/not meet/exceed your business relations requirement?

MET [☐]
NOT MET [☐]
EXCEEDED [☐]

Please explain how the Contractor met/did not meet/exceeded your business relations requirements and provide any strengths and/or weaknesses.

Business relations can be measured by the offeror's active participation during contract administration. This includes, but is not limited to, the timeliness, completeness and quality of problem identification; corrective action plans; customer satisfaction; and timely award and management of subcontracts.

4. MANAGEMENT OF KEY PERSONNEL: Has the Contractor's ability to manage key personnel met/not met/exceeded your requirement?

MET [☐]
NOT MET [☐]
EXCEEDED [☐]

Past Performance Questionnaire / Survey – Attachment 2
Solicitation: W912CZ-06-Q-0005 Protestant REC

Please explain how the Contractor has met/not met/exceeded the requirement for proper management of key personnel and provide any strengths or weaknesses.

Management of key personnel can be measured by the offeror's performance in selecting, training, retaining, supporting and replacing, when necessary, key personnel with personnel who have a breadth of experience and knowledge in contract management, and who have demonstrated their ability to carry out contract management for and on behalf of the Contractor.

5. OTHER:

(a) If applicable, what were the Contractor's strong points?

(b) If applicable, what were the Contractor's weak points?

(c) How would you rate this Contractor overall?

6. FINAL EVALUATIONS:

Exceptional - No performance problems. No Government / Supervisory oversight needed.
Displayed considerable initiative. Good work ethic. Would definitely hire again. []

Very Good - Displayed considerable initiative. Little Government / Supervisory oversight needed. Would hire again. []

Satisfactory - Displayed some initiative. Some Government / Supervisory oversight needed.
Would probably hire again. []

Marginal - Displayed little initiative. Substantial Government / Supervisory oversight needed.
Would probably not hire again. []

Unacceptable - Displayed no initiative. Failed to meet specified minimum performance. Would not hire again. Would not recommend. []

Neutral – Not enough information to rate []

Thank you for taking the time to complete this evaluation.